

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| Applicant | : | Bennett, et al. |
| App. No | : | 10/735,588 |
| Filed | : | December 12, 2003 |
| For | : | ULTRASOUND ASSEMBLY WITH INCREASED EFFICACY |
| Examiner | : | Baisakhi Roy |
| Art Unit | : | 3737 |
| Conf No. | : | 1726 |

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated September 16, 2010, Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer to overcome the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1-4, 9-11, 13-15, 21-27, and 53 over Claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,676,626. Applicants respectfully request that the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1-4, 9-11, 13-15, 21-27, and 53 be withdrawn.

Applicants appreciate the finding of the pending Claims 28-52 to be allowable. Applicants submit herewith the following comments on the Allowable subject Matter:

To the extent that there is any implication that the patentability of these allowed claims rests on the recitation of a certain feature or features and not each claim as a whole, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's Statement. Further, to the extent that the Examiner's Statement omits claim elements, groups claims together, or identifies purportedly distinguishing features of a claim or a group of claims, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's Statement. Rather, the Applicant submits that the allowed claims are allowable, because each